



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,596	06/12/2000	Richard Humpleman	SAM1.0067	7063

7590 11/21/2002

Kenneth L Sherman
Sherman & Sherman
Seventeenth Floor
2029 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/592,596	HUMPLEMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because some of the numbers in fig. 10 are unreadable. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
Page 28, line 24-25: Phrase “A proxy 117” should be changed to --A bridge 117--.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 12-20 objected to because of the following informalities:
Claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 should be dependent on claims 11, 11, 13, 11, 11, 16, 11, 11 and 19 respectively, because the claims that they depend on now are method claims and they are system claims. In making the prior art rejection below, it was assumed that claims 12-20 had the dependencies mentioned above.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-7, 9-17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lea.

As per independent claim 1, Lea teaches a method for providing user interfaces in a first network including first devices interconnected via a communication medium and at least one interface device connecting said first network to at least a second network having interconnected second devices, the user interfaces for controlling the devices that are currently connected to the first network and devices that are currently connected to the second network, comprising the steps of:

obtaining information from said first devices currently connected to the first network, said information including device information (col. 6, lines 38-46);

obtaining information from the interface device about the second devices connected to the second network (fig. 17A and fig. 17B; col. 26, lines 34-67);

generating a user interface description in one or more of said first devices based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description in each first device including: at least one reference associated with the device information of each of said first devices, and at least one reference associated with the device information of each of said second devices (from col. 6, lines 56-67 through col. 7, lines 1-25 and col. 24, lines 56-67).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches said interface device includes information about the second devices (fig. 17A and fig. 17B; col. 26, lines 34-67).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the first network comprises a 1394 bus (col. 7, lines 39-47 and *network 1750* of fig. 17B; col. 26, lines 59-67), and the second network comprises a non-1394 bus (*Service Provider 1720* of fig. 17B; col. 26, lines 59-67).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Lea teaches the interface device includes an address extension table for the second devices, and wherein step of obtaining information from the interface device further includes the steps of using the address extension table to access said second devices (col. 11, lines 48-67 and col. 26, lines 34-58).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, according to Lea's system, it is inherent that the intelligent device 301 (fig. 17B) would include a bridge device acted as an interface between home audio/video network and service provider network.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches displaying one or more user interfaces each based on one of said one or more user interface descriptions, on one or more devices connected to the first network capable of displaying a user interface, for user control of said first and second devices (from col. 6, lines 56-67 through col. 7, lines 1-38 and col. 24, lines 56-67).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Lea teaches the step of displaying each user interface further includes the steps of:

using each reference in the corresponding user interface description to access the associated information in each device; generating the user interface including device data corresponding to each device using the accessed information in each device; and displaying the user interface on said device capable of displaying a user interface (from col. 6, lines 56-67 through col. 7, lines 1-38 and col. 24, lines 56-67).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea teaches the device information in each device includes a user control interface description for user interaction with the device (from col. 6, lines 56-67 through col. 7, lines 1-38 and col. 24, lines 56-67).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Lea teaches the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description such that each reference in that user interface description is to at least the user control interface description in each corresponding device (from col. 6, lines 56-67 through col. 7, lines 1-38 and col. 24, lines 56-67).

As per independent claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lea in view of Venkatraman et al (“Venkatraman”).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Lea does not disclose the step of generating a user interface description further comprises the steps of: associating a hyper-text link with the device information of one or more of said first and second devices. Venkatraman discloses that in col. 3, lines 5-61. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Venkatraman of associating a hyper-text link with the device information of one or more of said first and second devices in Lea’s method since HTML would allow the devices to interface with Internet, from service providers, via HTTP protocol.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Pat. 6044403 to Gerszberg, Irwin et al. discloses network server platform for internet, JAVA server and video application server.

US Pat. 6337899 to Alcendor, Tommy et al. discloses speaker verification for authorizing updates to user subscription service received by internet service provider (ISP) using an intelligent peripheral (IP) in an advanced intelligent network (AIN).

US Pat. 6374293 to Dev, Roger H. et al. discloses network management system using model-based intelligence.

US Pat. 6480889 to Saito, Takeshi et al. discloses scheme for managing nodes connected to a home network according to their physical locations.

US Pat. 6157645 to Shobatake, Yasuro discloses ATM communication system and ATM communication method.

Inquires

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
November 15, 2002

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100